



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/621,393	07/18/2003	Mei-Ning Zhang	CHU 226	2443

7590 05/13/2005

RABIN & BERDO, P.C.
Suite 500
1101 14 Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005

EXAMINER :

NEILS, PEGGY A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2875

DATE MAILED: 05/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/621,393

Applicant(s)

ZHANG, MEI-NING

Examiner

Peggy A. Neils

Art Unit

2875

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, requires the specification to be written in "full, clear, concise, and exact terms." The specification is replete with terms, which are not clear, concise and exact. The specification should be revised carefully in order to comply with 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Examples of some unclear, inexact or verbose terms used in the specification are: "radiation means" should be changed to --illumination means--, "pervious member", "complicate structure", "pervious containing room", "the switch of the radiation unit is comparative to the circuits", "explored 3-D view", "stably", "automatically emits flash lights", and "the principles involved are susceptible for use". The above are only cited an examples of the numerous language and grammatical errors which appear through out the specification. Applicant needs to amend the specification to reflect proper English usage. Also Applicant should be using terms consistent in the art to describe the elements shown in the figures. Also it is not clear how the telephone relates to the invention.

Claim Objections

Claims 1-8 are objected to because of the following informalities: In Claim 1, "a body having a hole base on a suitable position" is unclear and awkward. It is not clear whether "room" is a structure or an opening. "Radiation unit" needs to be replaced and "which one surface" is not grammatically correct. In Claim 3, it is not clear what is meant by "capable of keeping an upper display of the pervious room". In Claim 4, "surface of the radiation unit is corresponding to a display" is awkward and unclear. In

Art Unit: 2875

claim 5, "is fit in" needs to be rewritten and "for the switching element elongating to a bottom portion" is unclear. It is not clear what limitation is being set forth in Claim 6. In Claim 7, "having flexibility" needs to be rewritten. In Claim 8, it is not clear how the telephone interrelates to the structure of the invention. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 4-6 and 8 as well as can be understood are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lu.

Lu shows an illuminated coaster in Figure 2 which includes a top part 13, bottom 11, a switch 24 positioned between the top and bottom parts, a plurality of light emitting diodes (LEDs), a circuit board 20 and a control chip 22. There is also a recessed area 14 to receive a glass. There are openings 23 in the recessed area and a transparent area 17 for emission of light. In an alternative embodiment shown in Figure 6, a transparent sheet 50 is positioned on the top surface of the coaster. The top and bottom parts appear to be secured together by a snap fit. The manner in which the coaster is secured is a matter of choice. The snap fit of Lu accomplishes the same result of securing the two parts together as a threaded connection would. Batteries 12

provide power. Regarding Claim 8, the control chip 22 could be used to provide a condition responsive lighting for the coaster.

Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lu as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of either of Jensen or Pearson.

Jensen teaches that it is known in the art to have an illuminated coaster with a gasket type member 36 at the upper portion of the coaster. While member 36 primarily acts as an insulative body it would also absorb condensation from the bottle. Pearson also shows an illuminated coaster with a cardboard insert 17 to absorb liquids (see column 5, line 40). In Lu, top 13 is readable as a ring. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art that Lu could be modified to provide a absorption type element on the coaster in the same manner as taught by either of Jensen or Pearson because all the references are directed to illuminated coasters.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lu as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Sautome

Sautome teaches that it is known in the art to have a pressure sensitive resilient switch to illuminate a coaster. While Lu shows an exterior manually activated switch, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art that Lu could be modified to have pressure activated switch for the coaster in the same manner as taught by Sautome because the coaster would only be illuminated when being used instead of being activated indefinitely with a manual switch and would be used in a more efficient manner.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Lewis et al, Kinzie, Wu and Lusareta are cited on interest.

Any questions regarding this Office action should be directed to Examiner Neils at (571) 272-2377.



**Y. MY QUACH-LEE
PRIMARY EXAMINER**